(Yeager et al., U.S. Patent 5,950,190). Specifically, Mr.

Colb pointed out that Yeager fails to teach multiple redundant instances of an on-screen control as recited in claim 1. The Examiner took the position that the arrows above the pull-down menu shown by Yeager in Fig. 4 are multiple redundant instances of this sort, but was unable to find any description in Yeager's specification that would support such a position.

Mr. Colb pointed out that in the absence of such support, the Examiner's position was untenable. The Examiner agreed to revisit Yeager.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-13, 16-19, 22-24, 27-30 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Yeager (cited above). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Yeager describes a dynamic database interface with multiple graphical windows for searching and editing the database contents (abstract). Yeager shows an exemplary search window in Fig. 4, which includes different parameter buttons 52 with input fields 53 for input of search terms (col. 10, lines 11-25). A pull-down list 54 provides a choice of mathematical operators from which an end user may choose (col. 10, lines 36-39). In addition to these specialized functions, Fig. 4 also includes the standard "OK," "Clear," "Help" and "Done" buttons.

Claim 1 recites a method for increasing efficiency of interaction by an operator with data on a display by placing multiple redundant instances of an on-screen control at different locations in the display. Selection of any of the instances actuates the control. As a result, the operator need make only a small movement of a pointing device to reach the closest instance (as explained on page 3, lines 23-25, in the present patent application, for example).

Yeager, by contrast, provides no such redundancy and makes no suggestion that this sort of redundancy might be Each of the operators in Yeager's pull-down list useful. refers only to a single, specific operation, which is applied to a single input field, identified by a single parameter In the Official Action, the Examiner stated that Yeager's blocks 52 and 54 (the various parameter buttons and the pull-down list) represent multiple redundant instances. Yeager, however, shows only a single pull-down list 54 in Fig. 4, and each parameter button 52 represents a different parameter and refers to a different input field. There is no evidence in Yeager's figures or in the text that there might be "multiple redundant instances" of the operators in list 54 "at different locations on the display," as required by claim 1.

In the interview, the Examiner then took the position that the arrowheads shown by Yeager in Fig. 4 are themselves multiple redundant instances of an on-screen control. These arrowheads are not mentioned in the specification, and there is clearly no support in Yeager for the Examiner's position that they are meant to be "multiple redundant instances of an on-screen control." As noted in MPEP 2131 (emphasis added):

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim," Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Yeager clearly does not meet this requirement.

Furthermore, even if it were assumed that every one of

Yeager's arrowheads was meant to have the same effect on its

corresponding parameter, the arrowheads would still not be

"redundant," since each one is associated with a different

parameter, having its own distinct meaning and input field.

Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Yeager. In view of the patentability of claim 1, dependent claims 2, 5-8 and 11 are also believed to be patentable.

Notwithstanding the patentability of claim 1, the dependent claims in this application are believed to recite independently-patentable subject matter. Claim 5, for

example, depends from claim 1 and recites that all of the multiple redundant instances of the on-screen control indicate that the operator has finished processing the data in the plurality of fields on the computer display. By contrast, Yeager provides only a single "Done" control on screen in Fig. 4. Although Yeager also shows an "OK" button, the meaning of this control is inherently different from "Done," so that the controls are not redundant. Furthermore, even if Yeager's "OK" and "Done" were considered to be redundant, these controls are not located in proximity to different ones of the data fields as required by the combined limitations of claims 1 and 5. Therefore, the subject matter of claim 5 is believed to be independently patentable.

The other dependent claims are similarly believed to recite independently-patentable subject matter, but specific arguments to this effect are omitted here for the sake of brevity.

Independent claims 12 and 23 respectively recite apparatus and a computer software product that operate on principles similar to the method of claim 1. These claims are therefore believed to be patentable for the reasons stated above. In view of the patentability of independent claims 12 and 23, dependent claims 13, 16-19, 22, 24, 27-30 and 33 are likewise believed to be patentable.

Appln. No. 09/902,733 Amendment dated January 17, 2006 Reply to Office Action of Nov. 17, 2005

Claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 20, 21, 25, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yeager in view of Kanatsu (U.S. Patent 6,628,832). In view of the patentability of independent claims 1, 12, and 23, dependent claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 20, 21, 25, 31 and 32 are also believed to be patentable.

Applicant believes the remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Norman J. Latker

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\C\colb\Zlotnick2\Pto\Amendment-AF 17Jan06.doc